**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT :**

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR**

**TUESDAY, THE 6TH MARCH 2007 / 15TH PHALGUNA 1928**

**WP(C).No. 7457 of 2007(K)**

**----------**

**PETITIONERS:**

**----------**

1. **STERLING SAROVAR APARTMENT OWNERS ASSOCIATION, KOSSERI LINE, PONEKKARA ROAD, EDAPPALLY, COCHIN-682 024, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY SHRI K.ANILKUMAR.**

2. **SMT. GIRIJA NAMBISHTADIRI, D/O KUNJULAKSHMYKUTTY NAMBISHTADIRI, NIRMALYAM, KOSSERI LANE, PONEKKARA ROAD, EDAPPALLY, COCHIN-682 024.**

3. **SMT. BEENA NARAYANAN, D/O. GIRIJA NAMBISHTADIRI, NIRMALYAM, KOSSERI LANE, PONEKKARA ROAD, EDAPPALLY,COCHIN-682 024.**

4. **SHRI PRADEEP VARMA, S/O GIRIJA NAMBISTADIRI, NIRMALYAM, KOSSERI LANE, PONEKKARA ROAD, EDAPPALLY, COCHIN-682 024, NOW WORKING IN KUWAIT REPD.BY THE POWER OF ATTORNEY HOLDER K.GOPINATHAN,S/O KAVUKUTTY AMMA, STERLING DARPAN,THAMMANAM, COCHIN- 682 032.**

5. **SMT.SHOBHA VARMA,D/O GIRIJA NAMBISHTADIRI, NIRMALYAM,PONEKKARA ROAD,EDAPPALLY, COCHIN- 682 0024, NOW IN U.S.A. REPTD. BY THE POWER OF ATTORNEY HOLDER K.GOPINATHAN,S/O KAVUKUTTY AMMA, STERLING DARPAN, GANDHI JAYANTHI ROAD, THAMMANAM, COCHIN-682 032.**

**BY ADV. SRI.P.V.CHANDRA MOHAN.**

**W.P.(C). NO.7457/2007:**

**RESPONDENTS:**
**----------**

1. **STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY**
   **SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, REVENUE DEPARTMENT,**
   **THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

2. **THE TAHSILDAR,**
   **KANAYANNUR TALUK, ERNAKULAM,**
   **COCHIN-11.**

3. **THE VILLAGE OFFICER,**
   **EDAPPALLY NORTH VILLAGE,**
   **ERNAKULAM.**

**BY SR. GOVT. PLEADER SRI. MOHAMMED RAFIQ.**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 06/03/2007,THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, J.

---

W.P.(C).No.7457 of 2007-K

---

Dated this the 6th day of March, 2007

**JUDGMENT**

The petitioners challenge Ext.P15 order of assessment assessing building tax for a residential complex and Ext.P16 demand notice. Against the assessment order, the petitioners have a right of appeal under the Act. Therefore, it is unnecessary for this Court to entertain this writ petition. Accordingly, it is dismissed without prejudice to the contentions of the petitioners and their right to invoke the statutory remedy.

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, JUDGE.

MS